

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 7, 9, and 10 were previously canceled. Claims 1-6, 8, and 11-15 are now pending. Claims 1-6 and 8 are amended, and claims 11-15 are added. Claims 1, 11, and 12 are independent.

Examiner Interview

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to the Applicant's representative, Carl T. Thomsen, Registration No. 50,786, in the telephonic interview conducted on July 19, 2006. The claims have been amended herein considering the helpful points made in the discussion with the Examiner during the interview.

Drawings

The Examiner has indicated that the drawings have been accepted.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to overcome this rejection, the Applicant has amended claims 1-6 and 8 to address each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner. The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by O'Harrow (U.S. 1,479,312). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 11, and 12

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the present application, independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a security door apparatus including *inter alia*

an upper horizontal slide guide and a lower horizontal slide guide disposed on one of an inner side of the entrance door or on a side of the door opening frame;

the auxiliary door having an upper and a lower corner on a first side connected to the horizontal slide guides disposed on the one of the inner side of the entrance door or the door frame opening frame, and an upper and a lower corner on a second side connected to a side of the entrance door or the door opening frame not having the horizontal slide guides.

In addition, independent claim 11 is added to recite a combination of elements directed to a security door apparatus including *inter alia*

an upper horizontal slide guide and a lower horizontal slide guide disposed on an inner side of the entrance door;

the auxiliary door having an upper and a lower corner on a first side connected to the horizontal slide guides disposed on the inner side of the entrance

door, and an upper and a lower corner on a second side connected to a side of the door opening frame.

In addition, independent claim 12 is added to recite a combination of elements directed to a security door apparatus including *inter alia*

an upper horizontal slide guide and a lower horizontal slide guide disposed on a side of the door opening frame;

the auxiliary door having an upper and a lower corner on a first side connected to the horizontal slide guides disposed on the door frame opening frame, and an upper and a lower corner on a second side connected to a side of the entrance door.

Support for the novel combination of elements set forth in independent claims 1, 11, and 12 can be seen in the application as originally filed, for example, as follows: Claim 1 in FIGS. 1 and 5; claim 11 in FIG. 1; and claim 12 in FIG. 5.

The Applicant respectfully submits that this combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claim 1, 11, and 12 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including O'Harrow.

As can be seen in O'Harrow FIGS. 1-3, this document merely discloses multiple shutters 1, 2, and 3 that have sides that are hinged together so as to flex with respect to each other, with shutter 3 being mounted to supporting plates 7 by four hinges.

As can be seen, O'Harrow fails to teach or suggest an upper or a lower horizontal slide guide disposed on either an inner side of the entrance door or on a side of the

door opening frame. Further, O'Harrow fails to teach or suggest an auxiliary door having an upper and a lower corner on a first side connected to the horizontal slide guides disposed on either the inner side of the entrance door or on the side of door opening frame.

At least for the reasons described above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of elements as set forth in each of independent claim 1, 11, and 12 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including O'Harrow. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

The Examiner will note that dependent claims 2-6 and 8 have been amended to place them in better form as well as to set forth additional novel features of the present invention.

For example, dependent claim 4 includes

upper and lower locking bearing parts provided on both the entrance door and the door opening frame; and

axial support parts provided at the four corners of the auxiliary door,

wherein the axial support parts on one of the first side and second side of the auxiliary door are detachably mounted to the locking bearing parts on the door opening frame or the door, and

wherein the axial support parts formed on the other of the first and second side of the auxiliary door are slidably attached to the horizontal slide guide.

By contrast, the O'Harrow document provides no such teaching or suggestion.

In addition, dependent claims 13-15 have been added to set forth additional novel aspects of the present invention.

By contrast, the O'Harrow document fails to teach the subject matter of claims 13-15.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/807,586
Amendment filed July 31, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2006

Docket No.: 0399-0130PUS1
Art Unit: 3634
Page 14 of 14

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Dated: July 31, 2006 

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James M. Slattery

Registration No.: 28,380

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant